



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,270	07/25/2003	Ulfar Erlingsson	08828.0006-00000	7588
22852	7590	12/06/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			HOMAYOUNMEHR, FARID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/627,270	ERLINGSSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Farid Homayounmehr	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/10/04

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement PTO-1449

1. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted by applicant on 3/10/2003 has been considered. Please see attached PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1 to 7, 10-17, 20 to 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moskowitz (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0200439, filed 4/14/2002).

3.1. As per claim 1, Moskowitz is directed to a method for providing secure transmissions across a network comprising a transmitting device and a receiving device (parag. 11, describing a transmission system that checks to see if transmitted

packets are authentic, and therefore describing a secured transmission), the method comprising: at the transmitting device, generating a stream of watermark bits (parag 30); generating a plurality of watermarks, each of the plurality of watermarks comprising an index number and a portion of the stream of watermark bits (parag 31, indicating an identifier (index) in each water mark, associating it with the watermark key); inserting at least one of the plurality of watermarks into each header of a plurality of outgoing packets (parag 30 to 43. Also see claim 1); receiving, at the receiving device, the plurality of outgoing packets (parag 44); and determining if a received packet is valid based on the watermark in the header of the received packet (parag 45-47. See also claim 2).

3.2. As per claim 2, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein generating the stream of watermark bits includes generating a stream of watermark bits from an authorization and synchronization packet previously exchanged between the transmitting device and the receiving device (paragraph 46 indicates that the WID is distributed from senders to the receivers prior to transmission of packets bearing the watermark, and according to paragraphs 31-32, the watermarks are generated based on the WID).

3.3. As per claim 3, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, further comprising activating a session by exchanging an authorization and synchronization packet

between the transmitting device and the receiving device (paragraph 46 indicates that a secure session is created between senders and receivers to distribute the WID).

3.4. As per claim 4, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, further comprising: discarding the packet, if the watermark is not valid (parag. 45).

3.5. As per claim 5, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein determining if a received packet is valid comprises: comparing the watermark of the received packet to a first and a second window, each of the windows comprising a set of expected watermarks; and accepting the watermark as valid if the received watermark matches one of the expected watermarks in the first or second windows (parag. 45 teaches comparing the watermarks to a table of WIDs to find the appropriate WID. Therefore it teaches comparing the watermarks to several windows containing a set of potential matching watermarks)

3.6. As per claim 6, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 5, wherein the set of expected watermarks are generated from an authorization and synchronization packet previously exchanged between the transmitting device and the receiving device (parag 46).

3.7. As per claim 7, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 5, comprising: discarding the packet, if the watermark does not match one in the first or second windows (parag 45).

3.8. As per claim 10, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein the stream of watermark bits is generated by a stream cipher (paragraph 30-32).

3.9. As per claim 11, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein inserting at least one of the plurality of watermarks includes determining whether a valid session exists and inserting the at least one of the plurality of watermarks only if the valid session exists (paragraph 46 indicates that the WID is sent in a secure session prior to sending the packets).

3.10. Limitations of claims 12-17 and 20-21 are substantially similar to claims 1-7 and 10-11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0200439, filed 4/14/2002).

5.1. As per claim 8, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 5, wherein comparing the watermark further comprises: maintaining at the server a record of a pivotal index number representing the index number of the highest-numbered valid watermark received from the transmitting device; comparing the watermark of the received packet to a first and a second window, each of the windows comprising a set of expected watermarks and wherein the first window represents expected watermarks whose index numbers precede the pivotal index number and the second window represents expected watermarks whose index numbers immediately supercede the pivotal index number (Moskowitz teaches comparing the packet's watermark to the watermarks in a first and second window as described in response to claim 5. Moskowitz also teaches recording and using a pivotal index number of representing the index number of the highest-numbered valid watermark received from the transmitting device in paragraphs 32-42. Considering the first packet in the sequence of packets as representing the highest-numbered valid watermark received from the transmitting device, the other packets in the sequence will have their corresponding matching watermark sequentially in the WID. For example, the matching watermark corresponding to the second packet is found in the WID at the

location superceding the first matching watermark corresponding to the first received packet (pivotal packet). Considering the last packet as the pivotal packet, the matching watermarks corresponding to the other packets in the stream of packets will be found sequentially at the preceding locations relative to matching watermark corresponding to the last packet of the stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in art to use the above mentioned teachings of Moskowitz, and implement an indexing method based on sequential ordering of matching watermarks and a pivotal packet as required by the claim limitation).

5.2. As per claim 9, Moskowitz is directed to the method of claim 8, comprising: increasing the pivotal index number if a match is found in the second window and deleting the matching expected watermark from the second window (see response to claim 8, and note that when the router (paragraph 45 verifies the validity of a packet, it will sequentially move to the next packet and deletes the useless data (matching watermark for the packet already verified) as it is standard practice in computer systems to delete the useless data).

5.3. Limitations of claims 18 and 19 are substantially similar to claims 8 and 9 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farid Homayounmehr whose telephone number is 571 272 3739. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hrs Mon-Fri, off Monday biweekly.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Farid Homayounmehr

Examiner

Art Unit: 2132